

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,304	12/29/2000	Abel C. Dasylva	57983.000012	6728
7:	590 12/02/2004		EXAMINER	
Thomas E. Anderson			BELLO, AGUSTIN	
Hunton & Williams 1900 K Street, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20006-1109			2633	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	9,
Advisory Action	09/750,304	DASYLVA ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Agustin Bello	2633	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth the ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing. FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection.  R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP  opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	eriod set forth in f the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require furthe	· ·	see NOTE below);	*.
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consideration	dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered a w or appended.	nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. ☐ Other:		<del>_</del>	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the newly added claims raise new issues that require further consideration. However, the examiner also maintains that the limitations are met by the cited references since with i=0 the formulas in the claim become linear in nature as opposed to logarithmic as argued. For example in claim 1, if i=0, then the frequency spacing becomes delta f or simply the original spacing between the adjacent channels. At the very least the combination of references meets limitations of the claimed invention based on this.

JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600